UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,912	10/14/2003	Michael A. Stokke	MS301462.1 / MSFTP462US	3556

27195 7590 03/29/2007

AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
OSBERG, THUY THANH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2179	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/684,912	STOKKE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thuy Osberg	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 March 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amendment filed 03/20/2007 to the original application filed 10/14/2003. **This action is made Final.**

A. Claims 1-32 are pending in the application.

B. Claims 4 and 30 were amended.

C. Claims 31-32 were newly added.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claim 32, in line 1 of claim 32, the phrase "system which" is missing the coma between. The examiner assumes the phrase "system which" in lines 1 of claim 32 refers to "system, which" for continuation of this examination. Appropriate correction is required.

Abstract

3. Applicant is reminded of the format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 15 lines and 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As to claim 30, a "data tangible packet" is being recited; however, the data packet constitutes a non-functional data structure that present non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

7. Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 14-22, 25, 27, 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaefer (US Pub 2003/0084429).

The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representation of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. The Applicant should consider the entire prior art as applicable as to the limitations of the claims. It is respectfully requested from the Applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the Examiner.

As claim1, Schaefer discloses user interface automation system (fig.2, label 210, 220 and 230) comprising:

an input component that receives a request (par [0037], lines 6-8);

and, a navigation component that receives the request from the input component (par [0037], lines 3-6) and facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component (par [0038], lines 1-3 and 5-8; par [0041]; par [0051]; par [0054]-[0055]; par [0071]), based at least in part, upon information stored in a map information store (par [0041], lines 1-3; par [0043]; par [0045]) and information stored in a command information store (par [0041], lines 8-14; par [0043]; par [0045]).

As claim 3, Schaefer further discloses the map information store comprises a text-based file (par [0048]), lines 11-14).

As claim 5, Schaefer further inherently discloses the navigation component further facilitates simulated user interface (par [0057], lines 10-11; par [0038], lines 1-3 and 5-8; par [0041]; par [0051]; par [0054]-[0055]; par [0071]), based at least in part, upon information stored in a global information store (par [0057], lines 15-16). The "Login.GUI" must be stored globally in an information store that can be accessed by users from any computer system.

As claim 6, Schaefer further discloses navigation component employing information stored in the global information store when a global variable is encountered in the command information store (par [0058], lines 6-7; par [0060]).

As claim 7, Schaefer further discloses at least one of the map information store and the configuration information store comprise at least one alias name (par [0050], lines 5-6).

As claim 8, Schaefer further discloses the navigation component further stores error information in a log information store (par [0115]-[0116]).

As claim 9, Schaefer further inherently discloses the navigation component further stores information associated with the request in a log information store (par [0115]-[0116]- It should be recognized that the steps of monitoring the results of the execution of the program, test engine component 170 may generate a text-based log file, and store information about the results of the execution including information about windows, GUI map for each window, objects on the window, Actions that were taken, a status of whether the test case passed or failed, TimeStart and TimeStop for a window action, etc.).

As claim 10, Schaefer further discloses the navigation component iterates through information stored in the command information store (par [0041], lines 8-14; par [0043]; par [0045]), performs the indicated operation (fig. 12; par [0115]) and stores information associated with the indicated operation in the log information store (par [0115]-[0116]).

As claim 11, Schaefer further discloses the navigation component stores error information in the log information store (par [0115]-[0116]).

As claim 14, Schaefer further discloses the input component receives a command line invocation (par [0012]), lines 1-5).

As claim 15, Schaefer further discloses the map information store comprising a section name (fig. 8c, label 825c; par [0081], lines 6-9) and a page identifier (fig. 8c, label 820c; par [0081], lines 6-9).

As claim 16, Schaefer discloses the page identifier comprising a label for a control (fig. 11, label 1100; par [0100], lines 5-10), the page identifier further uniquely identifying a particular page (fig. 8c, label 820c; par [0081], lines 6-9; fig. 8b, label 890b and 810a); par [0079], lines 1-13).

As claim 17, Schaefer further discloses the page identifier comprising a control type (fig. 11, label 1100; par [0100], lines 5-10).

As claim 18, Schaefer further discloses the control type is at least one of button, combo, list, scroll, static, radio and check type (fig. 11, label 1100 and 1140; par [0101], lines 1-5).

As claim 19, Schaefer further inherently discloses information stored in the command information store can be modified by at least one of a front-end user interface application, scripting, a batch file and a text editor (par [0093] that Schaefer discloses the associated GUI

map can be edit using a GUI map editor, since the command information store, which is associated with the GUI map, therefore it can be modified with the same concept).

As claim 20, Schaefer further discloses the command information store comprising a section name, the section name corresponding to information stored in the map information store, the command information store further comprising an action (fig. 13).

As claim 21, Schaefer further discloses the command information store storing information associated with at least one of a function key and a control key simulation (fig. 13).

As claim 22, Schaefer discloses a method of automating user interface (fig.2, label 210, 220 and 230) comprising: receiving mapping information from a map information store (par [0041], lines 5-8);
receiving command information from a command information store (par [0041], lines 8-14); performing simulated user interface (par [0038], lines 1-3 and 5-8; par [0041]; par [0051]; par [0054]-[0055]; par [0071]), based at least in part, upon information stored in the map information store (par [0041], lines 1-3; par [0043]; par [0045]) and the command information store (par [0041], lines 8-14; par [0043]; par [0045]).

As claim 24, Schaefer further discloses a computer readable medium (par [0045], lines 1-2) having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the, method of claim 22 (par [0040], lines 1-5).

As claim 25, Schaefer discloses a method of automating user interface (fig.2, label 210, 220 and 230) comprising: retrieving mapping information from a map file (par [0041], lines 5-8); retrieving command information from a command file (par [0041], lines 8-14);
obtaining a section name from the command file (fig. 8c, label 825c; par [0081], lines 6-9); retrieving page identification information from the map file associated with the section name (fig. 8c, label 820c; par [0081], lines 6-9; fig. 8b, label 890b and 810a); par [0079], lines 1-13); retrieving section data for section associated with the section name from the command file (fig. 10);

and, performing an action associated with the retrieved section data (fig. 11).

As claim 27, Schaefer further discloses a computer readable medium (par [0045], lines 1-2) having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the method of claim 25 (par [0040], lines 1-5).

As claim 28; Schaefer discloses a user interface automation system (fig.2, label 210, 220 and 230) comprising:
an input component that receives a request (par [0037], lines 6-8);
and, a navigation component that receives the request from the input component (par [0037], lines 3-6) and facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component (par [0038], lines 1-3 and 5-8; par [0041]; par [0051]; par [0054]-[0055]; par [0071]), based at least in part, upon information stored in a map information store (par [0041], lines 1-3; par [0043]; par [0045]) and information stored in a command information store (par [0041], lines 8-14; par [0043]; par [0045]).

As claim 29, Schaefer discloses a user interface automation system (fig.2, label 210, 220 and 230) comprising: means for receiving a request (par [0037], lines 6-8); and, means for simulating user interface associated with an automation component (par [0038], lines 1-3 and 5-8; par [0041]; par [0051]; par [0054]-[0055]; par [0071]), based at least in part, upon information stored in a map information store (par [0041], lines 1-3; par [0043]; par [0045]) and information stored in a command information store (par [0041], lines 8-14) the means for simulating receiving the request from the means for receiving (par [0037], lines 3-6).

(Currently amended) As claim 30, Schaefer discloses a tangible data packet transmitted between two or more computer components (par [0041], lines 5-8; par [0054]) that facilitates user interface simulation (par [0038], lines 1-3 and 5-8; par [0041]; par [0051]; par [0054]-[0055]; par [0071]), the data packet comprising: a section name (fig. 8c, label 825c; par [0081], lines 6-9) and a page identifier (fig. 8c, label 820c; par [0081], lines 6-9) that uniquely identifies a particular page (fig. 8c, label 820c; par [0081], lines 6-9; fig. 8b, label 890b and 810a); par [0079], lines 1-13) the page identifier comprising a label for a control and a control type (fig. 11, label 1100; par [0100], lines 5-10).

(New) As claim 31, Schaefer further discloses storing data, commands and executables associated with the user interface separately (par [0043]; par [0045]).

(New) As claim 32, Schaefer further discloses facilitates a modular system which can be modified without recompilation of the executable (Abstract, that a table driven test automation system for performing functional testing of a software program; par [0093]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer.

As claim 4, Schaefer does not specifically disclose the configuration information store comprises a text-based file.

However, Schaefer discloses a text-based file (par [0047], that HTML is a text based file; par [0048]), lines 11-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to use a text-based file for the command information store in order to store and organize information about a window and objects on the window, such as text fields, boxes, buttons, menus, etc., and making it easy to edit using available software programs installed with most operating systems (e.g., text editing program).

10. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Minard (US Patent 6,247,020).

As claim 2, Schaefer does not teach the automation component is a wizard.

However, Minard teaches the automation component is a wizard (fig. 4A; col. 3, lines 27-31; col. 6, the image showing the wizard menu along with the description of functions; col. 8, lines 41-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schaefer by using a wizard as the automation component as taught by Minard in order to improve the user interface that simplifies the job by removing numerous windows and consolidating all the functions into one unified window for the user interface with to design, edit and debug allowing the user to activate by the push of a button (Minard: col. 3, lines 20-33).

11. Claims 12-13, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Zimniewiez et al. (US Patent 6,744,450), hereinafter "Zimniewiez"

As claim 12, Schaefer does not teach the input component performs input validation upon the request and provides error information if the request is invalid. Schaefer does teach the basic principle and concept (par. [0110], that by when test data is to be entered into a text field, test engine component 170 may call an insert_text function. Software controller component 173 may transmit an appropriate instruction to the software program 185 to input the data into the object and may return the result of the processing of the instruction by the software program 185 to test engine component 170).

However, Zimniewiez teaches the input component performs input validation upon the request (col. 9, lines 36-38) and provides error information if the request is invalid (col. 8, lines 13-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schaefer by performing input validation in the input component upon the request and provides error information if the request is invalid as taught by Zimniewiez in order to order to provide the user with an indication the process is invalid and provides the user immediate feedback to initiate troubleshooting the cause of the invalid function/command (col. 8, lines 43-46).

As claim 13, Schaefer does not teach a graphical message is displayed to a user of the system, the graphical message being based, at least in part, upon the error information from the input component.

However, Zimniewiez teaches a graphical message is displayed to a user of the system, the graphical message being based, at least in part, upon the error information from the input component (col. 7, lines 22-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schaefer by displaying a graphical message to the user of the system, the graphical message being based, at least in part, upon the error information from the input component as taught by Zimniewiez in order to provide the user with an indication the process is invalid and provides the user immediate feedback to initiate troubleshot the cause of the invalid function (Zimniewiez:col. 10, lines 11-15).

As claim 23, Schaefer does not teach storing information in a log information store, if an error is detected performing the simulated user interface.

However, Zimniewiez teaches storing information in a log information store (col. 11, lines 52-56), if an error is detected performing the simulated user interface (fig. 4a, label 124 and 136; col. 7, lines 19-21; col. 8, lines 59-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schaefer by storing information in a log information store, if an error is detected performing the simulated user interface as taught by Zimniewiez in order to provide the user with an indication the process is invalid and provides the user immediate feedback to initiate troubleshot the cause of the invalid function (Zimniewiez:col. 10, lines 11-15).

As claim 26, Schaefer does not teach storing information in a log file, if an error is detected performing the action.

However, Zimniewiez teaches storing information in a log file (col. 11, lines 52-56), if an error is detected performing the action (fig. 4a, label 124 and 136; col. 7, lines 19-21; col. 8, lines 59-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schaefer by storing information in a log file, if an error is detected performing the action as taught by Zimniewiez in order to provide the user with an indication the process is invalid and provides the user immediate feedback to initiate troubleshot the cause of the invalid function (Zimniewiez:col. 10, lines 11-15).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 03/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejected to claims 1-32 is maintained.

a. **Applicant argues that** "Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments herein".

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. Examiner still concurs with the initial rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The applicants' addition of the word "tangle" being added before "data packets" still makes it a concrete rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

b. **Applicant argues that** "Claims *1,3,5-11,* 14-22,25 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Schaefer (US Pub 2003/0084429. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested since Scholl, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all aspects of subject claims".

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. First to identify the teachings of Scholl were never referenced in the Non-Final Action and notes this is an invalid argument by the applicant. The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as stated above and clearly taught by Schaefer.

d. **Applicant argues that** "the claimed invention relates to system and methodology to facilitate user interface automation. To this end, independent claim 1 recites ***a navigation component that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an***

automation component *based, at least in part, upon information stored in a map information store and information stored in a command information store.* Schaefer neither teaches nor suggests such novel aspects.

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner has noted the applicants arguments and now added additional references from Schaefer that directly teach "***a navigation component*** (par [0037], lines 3-6, test engine component) ***that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component*** (par [0038], lines 1-3 and 5-8; par [0041]; par [0051]; par [0054]-[0055]; par [0071]) *based, at least in part, upon information stored in a map information store* (par [0041], lines 1-3; par [0043]; par [0045]) *and information stored in a command information store* (par [0041], lines 8-14; par [0043]; par [0045]). As stated above by the Examiner the teachings of Schaefer clearly show the method and system to facilitate user interface automation.

e. **Applicant argues that** "Claim 4 stands rejected under *35* U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Schaefer relates to table driven automation testing for performing functional testing of a software program and does not teach or suggest every limitations with respect to independent claim 1 (from which claim 4 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claim 4 is not obvious over Schaefer. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn".

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner has noted the applicants arguments and now added additional references from Schaefer that directly teaches the obviousness of "a text-based file" (par [0047], that HTML is a text based file; par [0048]), lines 11-14). The Examiner stands by the rejection with the additional reference from Schaefer added.

f. **Applicant argues that** "Claim 2 stands rejected under *35* U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Minard (US Patent 6,247,020). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Schaefer and Minard either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Minard relates to development system with application browser user interface and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Schaefer with respect to independent claim 1 (from which claim 2 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claim 2 is not obvious over the combination of Schaefer and Minard. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn".

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner has noted the applicants arguments and now added additional references from Minard that when combined with the teachings of Schaefer directly teaches "the automation component is a wizard' (fig. 4A; col. 3, lines 27-31; col. 6, the image showing the wizard

menu along with the description of functions; col. 8, lines 41-51). The Examiner stands by the rejection with the additional reference from Minard added.

g. **Applicant argues that** "Claims 12, 13, 23 and 26 stand rejected under *35* U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Zimniewiez *et al.* (US Patent 6,744,450), hereinafter "Zimniewiez. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Schaefer and Zimniewiez either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Zimniewiez relates to system and method for providing multiple installation actions and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Schaefer with respect to independent claim 1 (from which claim 12 and 13 depend), 22 (from which claim 23 depends) and independent claim 25 (from which claim 26 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claims 12, 13, 23 and 26 is not obvious over the combination of"

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner has noted the applicants' arguments and now added an additional reference from Schaefer (par. [0110], that by when test data is to be entered into a text field, test engine component 170 may call an insert_text function. Software controller component 173 may transmit an appropriate instruction to the software program 185 to input the data into the object and may return the result of the processing of the instruction by the software program 185 to test engine component 170) that when combined with the teachings of Zimniewiez directly teaches "input component performs input validation upon the request

and provides error information if the request is invalid". As to claims 12, 13, 23 and 26 stand rejected as stated above.

Conclusion

13. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Osberg whose telephone number is 571-270-1258. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30AM-5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TTO

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER